UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,612	09/08/2003	Gopalan Ramanujam	42P14609	2531
7590 10/17/2007 Jeffrey S. Draeger			EXAMINER	
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard			MAI, TAN V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/658,612
Filing Date: September 08, 2003

Appellant(s): RAMANUJAM, GOPALAN

MAILED

OCT 17 2007

Technology Center 2100

Brent E. Vecchia For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 09/10/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 04/12/07.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-25 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-19 are directed to an apparatus for performing a conversion of packaged format values where the inputs are numbers and the result are also numbers. Claims 20-25 are directed to a method for performing a conversion of packaged format values. Claims 32-33 are directed to a tangible machine readable medium carrying an instruction for performing a conversion of packaged format values. In order for a claimed invention that is directed to such a method of calculation or a system for implementing calculations to be statutory, the claimed invention must accomplish a practical application. That is the claimed invention must transform an article or physical object to a different state or thing, or produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 U SPQ2d at 1601-02. Also see "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility", OG Notices: 22 November 2005. It is clear from claims 1-25 and 32-33 that the claims

Art Unit: 2193

merely involve calculations and manipulations of data in performing a mathematical operation on a list of number to produce output results in accordance with an algorithm as illustrated in figure 1. The claimed invention does not transform an article or physical object to a different state or thing. The input(s) is a number and the output is also a number. The result produced by claimed invention is merely number. It does not have a real world value as the claimed invention is not for any practical application, and thus is not useful. Therefore, the claimed invention is directed to non- statutory subject matter as the claimed invention fails to accomplish a practical application.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues practical application by useful result but the result is merely numbers. Therefore, the claims are not limited to a practical application of the mathematical algorithm because the result, numbers, is not a real-world result. It is clearly that the invention as recited in the claims is not being applied to appropriate subject matter because the invention merely involves in calculations and manipulations of data in performing a mathematical operation. The claimed invention performs mathematical operation on a list of numbers to produce output results that are also numbers, in accordance with an algorithm, without a practical application for the invention to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. The claimed invention clearly does not transform an article or physical object to a different state or thing. The result produced by claimed invention is merely number. It does not have a real world value since the claimed invention is not for any practical application, and thus is not

Art Unit: 2193

useful. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-25 and 32-33 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter is proper.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Tan V. Mai

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2193

Conferees:

MENG-AL T. AN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER STOO

Meng-Ai An

Eddie Lee

EDDIE C. LEE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER